

Terry Whalen

From: Shrimpton, Jeffrey (DOT) [Jeffrey.Shrimpton@state.ma.us]
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2010 11:49 AM
To: Terry Whalen
Cc: Pavao, Jr., Joseph (DOT); Damaris.Santiago@dot.gov; Roper, Stephen (DOT)
Subject: FW: Chatham Update

Hello Terry: Joe Pavao has asked me to respond to your question regarding Section 106 consulting parties. I have spoken with Damaris Santiago at FHWA to confirm that FHWA has identified the following Section 106 consulting parties for the Mitchell River Bridge project in Chatham pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2 and 800.3:

- FHWA, as the lead federal agency, and the State Historic Preservation Officer are automatically considered to be consulting parties.
- The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation also will be a consulting party if the Council should choose to participate.
- The Massachusetts Department of Transportation, as the applicant, and the Chatham Board of Selectmen (BOS), as the representative of local government, are entitled to be consulting parties.
- The Chatham Historical Commission (CHC) and the Friends of the Mitchell River Wooden Drawbridge (Friends) have expressed in writing their interest in being consulting parties.

FHWA will submit written invitations to the BOS, the CHC, and the Friends to formalize their status as Section 106 consulting parties. Any other parties interested in participating in the Section 106 consultation should identify themselves by writing directly to FHWA (Massachusetts Division) pursuant to 36 CFR 800.3(f)(3).

MassDOT does not have a Section 106 flow chart, but the Advisory Council has one on their website at the following link:

<http://www.achp.gov/regflow.html>

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Jeffrey Shrimpton
Cultural Resources Specialist
Massachusetts Department of Transportation -- Highway Division
Environmental Services
10 Park Plaza -- Room 4260
Boston, MA 01930-3973
Telephone: (617) 973-7497
Fax: (617) 973-8879
jeffrey.shrimpton@state.ma.us

From: Pavao, Jr., Joseph (DOT)
Sent: Wednesday, November 03, 2010 11:00 AM
To: Shrimpton, Jeffrey (DOT)
Subject: Fw: Chatham Update

Jeff,

Can you respond to the section 106 questions?

From: Terry Whalen
To: Pavao, Jr., Joseph (DOT)
Sent: Wed Nov 03 09:17:49 2010
Subject: FW: Chatham Update

Hi Joe,

Below please find a comment regarding the provision of additional clarity related to the identification of local consulting parties under the 106 Process. Is there a formal announcement/documentation process required under 36 CFR Part 800.3(f) identifying other consulting parties? If MassDOT has a flow chart or checklist used for implementing Section 106 and 4(f) it would be helpful for the Town to have a copy.

Also, do you have a projected time frame for when MassDOT will be scheduling meetings with local consulting parties?

Please let me know.

Thanks for your help,
Terry

From: Leonard Sussman [mailto:lsarch@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2010 1:58 PM
To: Terry Whalen
Subject: RE: Chatham Update

Thanks, Terry.

Good memo, and my only comment is that it's light on who exactly the consulting parties will be, or if not known at this time, how the selection will be made and by whom.

- Len

From: Terry Whalen [mailto:twhalen@chatham-ma.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2010 1:21 PM
To: Leonard Sussman
Cc: Linda Smulligan; Norman Pacun; Sam Streibert; Jeff Colby
Subject: FW: Chatham Update

Len,

Below please find an email from Joe Pavao, the Mitchell River Bridge's new project manager serving as an update on MassDOT's project status/approach in light of the eligibility determination.

Talk to you soon,
Terry

From: Pavao, Jr., Joseph (DOT) [mailto:Joseph.Pavao.Jr@state.ma.us]

Sent: Tuesday, November 02, 2010 12:32 PM

To: Terry Whalen

Cc: Paiewonsky, Luisa (DOT); Tramontozzi, Frank (DOT); Walsh, Kevin M. (DOT); Shrimpton, Jeffrey (DOT); Boundy, Stephanie (DOT); Bardow, Alexander (DOT); Elnahal, Shoukry (DOT); Mark_Shamon@URSCorp.com; Donald, Thomas (DOT); Haznar, Pamela (DOT); Crovo, Daniel S. (DOT); Louis-Jacques, Harry (DOT)

Subject: Chatham Update

Terry,

Thank you for hosting MassDOT last Friday to provide the Town with an update on the project status for the Bridge Street/Mitchell River Bridge replacement in Chatham.

To summarize a few key points from the meeting we had.

MassDOT is fully committed to moving forward with a replacement bridge as part of the Accelerated Bridge Program (ABP). It is important to recognize that the ABP is an 8yr program with a defined start and end date and that there are limited funds available for this bridge within the program. The Keeper's determination that the bridge is National Register (NR) eligible does not change our commitment to complete this project on time and on budget. It appears from going over the meeting minutes and design changes, that MassDOT has been proceeding in a context sensitive manner even prior to this designation. MassDOT has been investigating several mitigation measures that have been proposed at our public meetings in Chatham. As a result of the NR eligibility determination, MassDOT will complete a formal Section 106 process to document the mitigation for the adverse effect of the bridge removal with the ultimate goal of having a Memorandum Of Agreement (MOA) signed by the Section 106 consulting parties.

It is important to note that MassDOT will not pursue any options that involve wooden substructures in the water. We believe we can achieve a 75 year design life using modern materials and still design a context sensitive bridge that will successfully mitigate the replacement of the existing NR eligible timber bridge. Please keep in mind that the replacement structure will be turned over by MassDOT to the Town for maintenance and therefore we are striving for a 75 year life with minimal maintenance over the life of the structure.

The following is a list of goals and mitigation measures discussed to date and how we intend to proceed:

- Provide a structure that will last 75 years with minor maintenance through the use of modern materials while creating a context sensitive design that will be appropriate for this setting.
- Continue to investigate wood cladding for the concrete caps (substructure) as part of the design.
- Document and provide explanation for choosing a concrete/steel substructure to the Section 106 consulting parties.
- Incorporate comments for the type of stone cladding for the pier structure.
- Evaluate alternative of a crash tested timber traffic rail as opposed to a standard concrete/steel BR2 crash rail.
- Evaluate the possible re-use of the existing (or parts of the existing) pedestrian railing. This can only be accomplished with a crash tested timber traffic rail or keeping the BR2 as

proposed.

- Confirm the size of the pier (minimized) to house the moveable components as requested by the Town.
- Evaluate an alternative swing traffic safety gate as opposed to the vertical swing gates as requested by the Town.
- MassDOT will propose a 30mph design based on comments received at previous meetings. This will allow for a similar vertical profile to what exists today.
- MassDOT will pursue a 2' shoulder (reduced from 4') as requested by public comment to match the existing structure width. (Town has already provided a letter from the local bike advocates supporting this decision)
- MassDOT intends to propose a timber deck for the sidewalk, but has reservations regarding the use of wood timbers for the main bridge deck.
- MassDOT will evaluate three superstructures for life cycle costs; a full wooden superstructure, a wood deck on steel girders, and concrete deck beams with a poured concrete surface. These results will be discussed at the next meeting.
- There was some discussion regarding the available treatments for concrete finishes. MassDOT will provide and evaluate concrete coloring and texturing that looks like a wood deck. The Town suggested that maybe the sidewalk should match if we pursue this option. MassDOT agrees that this would be the preferred option, if desired by the Section 106 consulting parties.
- MassDOT is in the process of scheduling a full underwater investigation of the piers in order to evaluate the cost and extent of work necessary to rehabilitate the substructure. This will be required as part of the Section 106 and preparation of 4(f).
- The next step will be to hold a meeting with the local consulting parties outlining the results of the deck study and justification of a steel/concrete substructure.
- MassDOT will need to revise the 25% plans and intends on holding another public hearing. This will only be scheduled once there appears to be a consensus from the Section 106 consulting parties regarding the mitigation measures to be included in the MOA.

In summary, MassDOT is hopeful that we can complete an MOA in a timely manner that will be acceptable not only to the bridge preservation advocates, but also to the Town, the public and ultimately FHWA. Getting support from these interested parties will be critical to the schedule and our ability to meet the requirements of the accelerated bridge program, and therefore, I will be asking for your assistance in working with the local interested parties to find an acceptable mitigation package. As I mentioned at the opening of the meeting, our goal is to work with the Section 106 consulting parties to provide a replacement structure that is first and foremost safe for all users; can be permitted; will provide the most cost effective use of tax payer dollars; and will satisfy the Section 106 requirements.

If I left anything out, please let me know. I did not have everyone's email so please forward to the other attendees. We look forward to working with the Town and other interested parties towards an acceptable design for this location.

[Joseph A. Pavao, Jr., P.E.](#)
MassDot - Highway Division
Accelerated Bridge Program
10 Park Plaza, Rm 6500
Boston, MA 02116
Tel: (617) 973-8178
Fax: (617) 973-7554
Joseph.pavao@state.ma.us

www.mass.gov/massdot